

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Douglas Hall,)	
)	C/A No.: 1:10-cv-03173-GRA-SVH
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	(Written Opinion)
Linda Mitchell,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Douglas Hall, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brings this “Motion to Suppress of Evidence,” which this Court liberally construes as a Motion to Compel Discovery filed on June 7, 2011. ECF No. 37. The Defendant opposes this motion. ECF No. 39. For the following reasons, Plaintiff’s Motion is DENIED.

Standard of Review

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982). A court may not construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir.1993), nor is a district court required to recognize “obscure or extravagant claims defying the most concerted efforts to

unravel them." *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir.1985), *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1088, 106 S.Ct. 1475, 89 L.Ed.2d 729 (1986).

Discussion

Plaintiff was a pretrial detainee incarcerated at Union County Detention Center ("UCDC") at the time he filed this civil rights action, which is this Court construes as brought pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983.

Pursuant to the March 23, 2011 scheduling order issued by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, discovery was due by May 23, 2011. ECF No. 26. Plaintiff filed his discovery motion on June 7, 2011, which was after the discovery deadline. ECF No. 37. It does not appear that Plaintiff made any attempt to conduct discovery prior to the discovery deadline. Moreover, Plaintiff's discovery request does not allow Defendant time to respond or answer within the discovery deadline. Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery is untimely and DENIED.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Ross Anderson, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

December 5, 2011
Anderson, South Carolina